

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant acknowledges, with thanks, receipt of the office action dated December 12, 2006 and completion of the telephonic interview of March 23, 2007. The Examiner's observations are appreciated, and have been incorporated into the subject response.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,240,456 to Teng et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,386,271 to Maekawa et al. Claims 3, 9, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Teng in view of Maekawa and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,574,618 to Eylon et al. Claims 7, 11, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Teng and Maekawa and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,788,429 to Clough et al.

By way of review, the subject application teaches a system whereby document processing operations by dissimilar devices will result in uniform or standardized messages to reflect a status of the device. Common network environments will frequently involve devices, such as printers, from various manufactures. Different devices will frequently generate their own status indicator representative of a state of the device or a status of a document processing operation. This often results in confusion to a user, since a message generated from one device may appear different than that generated from a different device, even though both messages may be referring to a similar aspect. The subject application teaches a mechanism by which a controller associated with each document processing device is identified, and status messages resultant from each controller are output to a user in a mutually consistent manner.

In contrast, Teng teaches a HTTP printing system which allows for communication of printer status messages. Such messaging is a relay of a printer status, and is thus in a format dictated by the printer. Maekawa is directed to a system by which employs fuzzy logic to identify abnormal copier operating conditions. As discussed, an advantage of the subject teachings is the provision of a system and method by which status codes from different document processing devices are mapped to a uniform set of messages which are in turn relayed to a user. This is far removed from passing messages back in the same form as generated. It is also far removed from a fuzzy logic analysis which employs weighting functions in order to ascertain error conditions.

In view of the forgoing, amendment to each independent claim has been made to further clarify these distinctions and render the claims more clearly distinct over the art of record. Amendment to each independent claim has been made to reflect that a user receives a uniform message from devices, which uniform message is a result of a match from an identification of messages from a particular device.

It is also noted that the Examiner's applied art is directed to copiers while the claims are directed to printers. Insofar as both are document processing devices, amendment to the claims has been made to include document processing devices, such as printers. In view of the discussions and applied art, it is submitted that this amendment does not substantively impact the forgoing.

In view of the afore-noted amendments and comments, it is respectfully submitted that all claims are in condition for allowance over the art of record. An early allowance of all claims is respectfully urges.

If there are any fees necessitated by the foregoing communication, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0902, referencing our Docket No. 66329/14562.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Susan L. Mizer  
Registration No. 38,245  
TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP  
1150 Huntington Bldg.  
925 Euclid Ave.  
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1414  
**Customer No.: 23380**  
Tel.: (216) 696-3466  
Fax: (216) 592-5009

Date: April 18, 2007